FREE SOCIETY

A PERIODICAL OF ANARCHIST THOUGHT, WORK, AND LITERATURE.

VOL. X. NO. 27. CHICAGO, SUNDAY, JULY 5, 1903. WHOLE NO. 421.

To A Free Woman.

In face of death, if I might have one thought,
That only thought should be
Spent on the best gift life to love hath brought:
On thee!

If I might have one dying wish fulfilled,
That wish were but that thou
Might clasp me closely even while I willed;
As now.

Might clasp me for a moment without speech;
Till I could feel arise
My dying spirit, springing up to reach
Thine eyes.

My head supported in thy faithful arms
Against thy trembling breast,
I could forget all life's and death's alarms,
At rest.

For thou hast helped me pluck love's sweetest flowers
And leave its weeds unreaped;
Nor bitter fruits have we within love's bowers
Upheaped.

For thou hast lifted passion far above
What chained passions give:
In freely loving we have learned to love,
And live.

In face of death, wert thou but with me there,
And I might have my will;
And wert thou as thou art, so sweet, so fair,
So still!

Then would I do a deed of perfect bliss,
While death awaited so;
Would take from off thy lips one burning kiss,
And go!

WILLIAM FRANCIS BARNARD.

—o—

The Labor Movement in Spain.

PART II

At the close of the year 1863, Isabel II had been dethroned, a provisional government purely bourgeois had been established, and a Constitutional Cortes convoked. The youth among the laboring class accepted with enthusiasm the republican propaganda, which was mixed with Socialistic sentiment in order to secure proselytes; thru these converts, votes in the committees, and fighters in the districts were gained. We attribute this combination to the propaganda because before this time Pi y Mongall in his book, "Reaction and Revolution," had written these words: "I condemn as absurd and tyrannical all forms of government." . . . "The republic is still might and tyranny." Passing judgment on the Republicans, at that time his fellow-partizans, he said: "They aspire to be a government immediately. There you have the cause of the unrest." These declarations, if they did not reach the mass of the people, for the most part unlearned and illiterate, were not gnored by the bourgeoisie youth, who by their new position in life were enabled to receive instruction at the universities.

At that time and under such conditions there reached Spain the echo of the ringing words of Marx, "Laborers of the world, unite!" This message, brought to Madrid by Fanelli, an inspired disciple of Bakunin, kindled a small group of laborers. This spark found combustible material, and has never since been extinguished. Altho its converts underwent various vicissitudes, disdain, calumny, exile, imprisonment, torture, death,—today it is a formidable and threatening flame.

The Marx proclamation of the International, showing the incapacity of the bourgeoisie to progress by usurpation of social wealth, that retains its exclusive right, excluding forever the toiler, cooled the political ardor of that group. They were quick to comprehend the truth and to follow the new way that was offered.

From the first the group manifested wisdom and dignity. Finding themselves in a revolutionary period they were wise enough to cast aside any turbulent, demagogical characteristics, and showed themselves calm and intellectual. This was brought about in the following manner. A group of bourgeoisie youth constituting a "Society for the Reform of Taxes," held periodical public meetings, where aspiring politicians made a show of what they had learned and practised at a kind of fencing with words. Among this group, many of whom are now dead, were the present officials, Silvela and Moret, life-long skeptics, whose death will be the greatest benefit they can afford humanity.

Before this society appeared the initiators and organizers of the International in Spain. The writer of this article, now a man of sixty years, then a mere youth, expounded the program of the International and also of the Alliance of Socialistic Democracy, showing himself inspired by the labor organizations of Marx, and the Anarchistic ideals of Bakunin. They did not comprehend me, and becoming irritated under the criticism of their society, and the exposition of proletarian ideals, they insulted me. The hypocrits could not endure that I should add to the ten commandments, the sermon on the mount, and the Declarations of the Rights of Man, these maxims of the International, "There are no rights without duties, no duties without rights."

Then there arose a young man and with an inspired eloquence of which no one believed him capable, and which by its grandeur humbled the university orators, he said: "Is falsehood always to pass for truth, iniquity for justice? Do you dare qualify as erroneous and utopian our ideal for establishing a society that shall extend common rights to all mankind, society without class distinctions, where the proud shall no longer tyrannize over the meek, the rich oppress the poor, where the honor of maid and matrons shall no longer demand the prostitution of so many unfortunates, who from the brothels pay tribute to the State, and satiate the infamous lewdness of the incontinent! Dare oppose it, I invite you; but first you must be logical. Revenge yourselves on progress; hate it, because progress gives us reason. Progress is no unconscious movement, it does not always revolve about abuses, but it goes steadily forward, leaving primitive ignorance for relative perfection, up towards the sublime conceptions of justice. Are these things new for you? Do you call yourselves democrats, yet you need a workman, one who can scarcely read and write, to tell you these things!" The name of that young man, now dead, is worthy of commemoration; he was called Tomas Gongalez Morago. His memory softens my heart.

The result of that meeting was great. After much activity in organization, and the diffusion of ideas, among them the proclamation of 1869, which has already been mentioned, there was the celebration of the Labor Congress at Barcelona in June, 1870. Here a hundred delegates, representing labor associations in the territories of Andalusia, Valencia, the Castillas and Cataluna, unanimously voted for uniting the Spanish proletarian movement with that of the International Labor Association. The aspirations of that Congress of Spanish proletarians might be summed up in these words of a young printer, Rafael Farga Pellicer: "We desire the cessation of the rule of capital, of the State, and of the Church, in order to erect upon its ruins Anarchy, the federation of voluntary associations of producers."

Stimulated by the acceptance of my first article, and by your encouragement to continue, I will arouse my memory, and endeavor to be useful, I, a Spaniard, as well as you North Americans, to the laborers of that land, whom I love as brothers.

ANSELMO LORENZO.

—o—

Liberty is the elixir of life. B.

The Enemies and the Friends of the Workingmen.

In a sermon, a portion of which appeared in *The Public*, Herbert S. Bigelow, takes District Attorney Jerome of New York to task for saying to workingmen:

> Don't accept any wishy-washy stuff about the brotherhood of man, or economic forces, or inherent rights. Ever since man has been able to stand on his hind legs he has been striving for all he can get. If you are strong, you win; if you are not, you lose. Distrust all men who come to you with broad schemes for settling all social and economic questions permanently. Can any scheme be invented which will be a cure-all for evils to come? Not on your life.

Now, while I have no more sympathy with Mr. Jerome than has Mr. Bigelow, I hail his words as coming from the kingdom of truth. He was no doubt making an argument against Socialism, but it applies equally to all political parties. Clothe men with a little brief authority and they immediately get on their "hind legs and strive for all they can get." Of course, Mr. Bigelow's party is an exception. The Single Taxer is always a "gentleman, a scholar, and a good judge of" politics.

Mr. Bigelow calls Jerome's argument, "atheism at work, that is, the doctrine that tnere is no God, applied to the labor problem." Politicians, like theologians, are apt to differ somewhat as to the nature of their God; and in this respect I am inclined to believe that Mr. Jerome is no atheist. He was simply warning the people against "strange Gods." His God is simply politics, devoid of any principle of change, that is to say, he would make no god of "schemes for settling all social and economic questions permanently."

But really it seems to me the god of Socialism ought to be able to "see" the Single Tax "and give him odds." If God can only work thru politics, the Socialist has the best of the argument. While the Single Taxer stakes a good deal on "economic forces," the Socialist has nearly a monopoly of "inherent rights" and the "brotherhood of man." But I prefer the complete atheism of the Anarchist. Because Jerome cries out against the economic reformers, saying, "Another panacea, a cure-all. Will it work? Not on your life," Mr. Bigelow wonders how he can trust a doctor with his sick child.

Well, there are some things in common with politics and medicine, and I may add religion. But, while medicine is always an experiment, it has been known or at least, largely believed to have effected cures, yet occasions never force us to employ politics, or religion. These are forces of war, and always tend to arouse the evil passions of men. They are essentially the spirit of partyism. Mr. Bigelow believes "there are skilled physicians, as well as quacks among economic reformers, as among doctors of medicine." Perhaps, but the trouble is, to distinguish between them—one is as much entitled to political power as the other; and the quack *is always the man that wins*. Mr. Bigelow poses as a *skilled physician*. But *they all do that*, and their plan is all right until power is given them. Then *worldly self* manipulates the wires.

The wishy-washy stuff "answers very well to build up a party," and it may require a "skilled physician" to properly apply the "stuff." But when the party meets success, a new factor is given them—*power*. The ocupation of the "skilled physician" is gone. "New occasions teach new duties." The question now is better handled by the quack. Subtility is now required—a cunning policy—not to effect the reform for which it was called to power, but to retain its power: "*to get on its hind legs and grab all it can*."

Says Mr. Bigelow:

> Doubtless the reformer, in his enthusiasm expects too much from his plan. Republican institutions have not saved the world, as some expected, but that does not prove anything for monarchy.

Why, no! Republican failure was doubtless due to the fact that they did not adopt the Single Tax. Again he says:

> Suppose the man who planned the Brooklyn bridge had been as contemptuous of theories of mechanics as our vaunted statesmen frequently are of theories of political economy?

Had the Brooklyn man met with as many failures in mechanics as "our vaunted statesmen" have in political economy, the bridge would never have been built.

Mr. Bigelow is optimistic in assuming the words of Mr. Jerome to be an "admonition of brute force." He sees that it "is not likely to take the place of ethical ideals as the controlling principle of conduct." He had said: "Labor is Sampson. If he were so minded he could with one sweep of his right arm, brush away the pillars of State and bring down to ruin the good as well as the evil in our social structure." And the reason he does not do this is, "because the average man is controlled by this conception of what is just and right." And it must seem singular to Mr. Bigelow that, having this "conception," how the "average man" can refuse to vote for the "Single Tax." Again Mr. Bigelow says:

> What is to hinder the working people, when they learn their power, from playing the tyrant?

What indeed? Certainly not this conception of what is just and right, for every party tyranny is moved by this "conception." It is a peculiarity of the "class conscious." Give a man power, and he always works out his "conception of what is just and right" And if his methods cannot be squared by his conception, why, he then reflects that the end justifies the means. Mr. Bigelow is entirely wrong in his theory as to why the "working people do not play the tyrant." His reason would be an incentive rather than a hindrance. The difficulty is simply owing to the fact that they cannot agree as to the road and guides to reach their desire. Tyranny is ever the result of power, and the worst tyrant is he who acts from a sense of duty, one who has a clear "conception of what is just and right." The trouble with Mr. Bigelow is, he, like the leaders of Socialistic thought generally, have no conception of practical politics. He knows that all political parties have been corrupt as hell, but he lays it all to the iniquity of leaders; like the believers in government, who realize that all governments under heaven have been corrupt, but lay it all to the abuse of power. If good men, "high-minded men, men who know their rights and knowing dare maintain," could only take the reins?

"How long, oh Lord, how long" will men wander in this labyrinth of power, expecting the sun of liberty to illuminate its dark recesses? How long will people trust to leaders whose natures like the dyers hands disclose their occupation?

A. LeRoy Loubal.

—o—

Woman and Cooperation.

How many weak and nervous women today, would give the world to know the causes of their depressed condition. Woman lives from day to day ever the same humdrum, monotonous life; never going out or seeing any one, her existence almost entirely made up of physical work.

In the evening the husband arrives at a regular hour. He has mingled with people all day. His supper finished, he is content to fall asleep over his evening paper.

Nervous, isolated woman wonders why she is growing worn and old, and caring nothing for her personal appearance.

The truth is, the family life as we know it today is a very narrow one; and while man is partially compensated thru his daily associations in business life, woman is practically debarred from having healthful contact with her fellow-beings. So many of our normal activities depend upon social life that it is plain woman today must be starved in her development. Her nervousness, irritability, and many of her shortcomings may be traced mainly to these facts.

There is a remedy for all this: cooperation. There are two very desirable ways for families to cooperate. One is this: let there be a house and grounds with plenty of room inside and out, each individual living on the premises volunteering to do as much work as is necessary and the work he or she is most suited to, with the help of a good, reliable house-keeper, one competent to do the general managing. This plan is most suited to colonies. The other way, which is suited to present conditions, is to have a house built in suites of rooms, or flats varying in size according to the numbers in the various families; each woman doing her own house work. In this building let be situated large public parlors and libraries. (All inmates donating furniture and books to be at the disposal of all inhabitants,) where musical, social, literary, and all kinds of amusements may take place.

This cooperative life will increase both happiness and health. The two sexes should mingle together in social and intellectual life, where each and all can receive and impart emotion, thoughts, health!

As soon as we learn that it is to our own personal advantage to have the feeling that our loved ones are free and not caged animals, for one to admire, we will become better, more healthy, and more noble men and women; we will then be more worthy to walk in progressive paths. Minerva.

—o—

Many of the cartoons on the Servian affair, as those on the Kishineff slaughter, are drawn in such a way as to call attention to equally great horrors here at home. This is at least common fairness; but it means much more; it means that Americans are beginning to see things a little less thru patriotism. If our eyes were only wide open! Americus.

Socialism and Authority.

I have often seen it stated in FREE SOCIETY that Socialism is authoritarian, but unfortunately the statement has never been backed by quotations or references. About a year ago the same statement was made in *Lucifer*, and Charles H. Kerr called for corroboration from the writings of some Socialist of international reputation. Two replies were given. J. William Lloyd could give no quotation, but he said that free land and free secession were necessary to liberty, for without them the individual was "enslaved to the collectivity." Lloyd doubted whether Socialists would allow these things. He was soon reassured. It was explained that Socialists have given most of their attention to the economic question; but, so far as that is concerned, they concede all that Mr. Lloyd wants. They do not wish to force anyone into the collective industries, but advocate freedom of individual industry and property, and of voluntary cooperation. They also favor free land; altho, as I pointed out, it could not be reasonably expected that in a country like Belgium, where there is not enough land to go round, land should always be open for the use of seceders. These statements of Socialist policy were backed by quotations from Engels, Vandervelde, Kautsky, Deville, Fabian tracts, etc.

The other reply came from A. Isaak, who quoted a passage in which Kautsky spoke of wages under Socialism, and asked how wages could be reconciled with liberty. This was never answered, but I think the best answer is to quote the following words from Kautsky's "Social Revolution," page 166:

> The most manifold forms of property in the means of production—national, municipal, cooperatives of consumption and production, and private can exist beside each other in a socialist society—the most diverse forms of industrial organization, bureaucratic, trades union, cooperative and individual; the most diverse forms of remuneration of labor, fixed wages, time wages, piece wages, participation in economies in raw material, machinery, etc, participation in the results of intensive labor.

Kautsky believes, in fact, that those who wish Communism should have it, and those who wish Individualism should have it. He thinks there is plenty of room in the world for both. This seems to me more consistent with liberty than any other way of settling the matter.

Unfortunately the discussion in *Lucifer* had to stop, as the paper is not specially devoted to such questions; but I think it might well be taken up in FREE SOCIETY. I suggest that those who object to Socialism as authoritarian should produce extracts from standard writers in support of their objections. I may say at once that Bellamy was not connected with organized Socialism, and the Socialist party is no more responsible for him than for Plato and Sir Thomas More. He was a great man, all the same. Charles H. Vail holds authoritarian views which I cannot support, and Blatchford has a tendency in the same direction. I therefore suggest that the discussion be confined to the writings of Marx, Engels, Liebknecht, Bebel, Kautsky, Lafargue, Deville, Ferri, Vandervelde, Morris, and the Fabian tracts and essays.

I am not anxious to prove that Socialism is in no respect authoritarian. Like Mirabeau I have swallowed all formulas, including the liberty formula. Moreover, I find that all systems of society ever proposed, not excepting the various forms of Anarchism, turn out on close analysis to be more or less authoritarian. But Socialists are often charged with authoritarian views which they do not hold. My aim, therefore, is to get the critics of Socialism to drop generalities, and make specific statements which can be specificially dealt with. R. B. KERR.

COMMENT.

The best way to effectively answer the question, Is State Socialism authoritarian? is not to select passages from Socialist authors who stand for authority in specific cases, but rather to uncover the very soul of State Socialism by showing that it becomes and continues successful, if at all, because it represents authority first, last, and all the time. What is the State but crystalized authority? What is an act of government other than a manifestation of authority? What are votes, what are elections save authority rampart or on the way to become so? R. B. Kerr is laboring under that sad delusion respecting authority and all its works which vitiates the conclusions of a man who will not remove his habitation from the vicinity of a sewer, declaring that it is not foul. State Socialism is too near and dear to him to be seen as it is. All association involving government, the State, collective *ownership* of the means of production, officials, etc., is authoritarian or nothing.

What will State Socialism be in practise? Ask Jaures, Millerand, Bernstein; these men all believe in authority and are seeking it. What is the "class struggle" as interpreted by its State Socialist advocates but a struggle for authority? What are the Socialists attempting but the "conquest of political power"? R. B. Kerr must not ask us to take the will for the deed, must not ask us to read those writers who exclude authority by the way of the door only to covertly let it in by the window. Rule is authority, the facts will have it so.

But turning away from this to the method of which Mr. Kerr avails himself in his defense of "Socialism," it is first to be noted that he concedes that Bellamy was authoritarian, that Chas. H. Vale is, and that the great Nunquam, Robert Blatchford, England's great Socialist editor, is tarred with the same stick. After that he names several authoritarians (governmentalists) in whose writings *he* finds no authoritarian utterances; and Karl Kautsky he fixes upon as one who, specificially opposing authoritarianism, makes it clear that the charge of being authoritarian will not stick to State Socialism.

But Kautsky is Kautsky, while State Socialism is authority itself. Perhaps a counter quotation from Kautsky will do more to unseat the heroes of State Socialism from their thrones in the estimation of R. B. Keer than any argument could do. Let him read the following from Kautsky's "Basis of Social Democracy," Chap. X.

> Socialist production is not compatible with liberty of work; that is to say, with the worker's freedom to work when or how he likes. . . . . It is true, under the rule of capitalism a worker still enjoys liberty up to a certain degree. If he does not quite like a factory, he can find work elsewhere. In a Socialist society all the means of productitn will be concentrated by the State, and the latter will be the only employer; there will be no choice. The workman today enjoys more liberty than he will possess in a Socialist society.
>
> It is not Social Democracy that eliminates the right of chosing work and time, but the development of production itself.

Let R. B. Kerr compare the above with the passage which he quotes from Kautsky, and afterwards he will perhaps read his authors more carefully.

But to return to our first point of view: Authoritarianism becomes Jesuitical at times even as it becomes opportunist, and would deny itself for a mess of pottage (votes); however, as the machinery of State Socialism comprises inevitably votes, officials, laws, government, fire might more easily hide its heat than State Socialism its whip and scourge—authority. AMERICUS.

—o—

Letter From London.

There was a mistake in my former letter: the approximate cost of the Taff-Vale strike to the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants was £50,000, and not £120,000, as I wrote. The reason of the mistake was that the officials of the union affected a settlement in private with the company, and the amount was not stated publicly. I got my information from a prominent labor leader, who should have known better.

I notice you speak of Will Crooks, the new M. P. for Woolwich as a Socialist. This is a mistake. At Woolwich he ran as labor candidate, and the distinction is very important over here. Altho he works with the Social Democrats, he is a member of the National Democratic League, an organization that has been trying for years, without the slightest success, to harmonize the Radical Democrats, as they like to call themselves, and the Social Democrats. Crooks is a rough workingman with some sense of humor, and is very popular inthe East End. He was put up to fight Woolwich, and the Labor Representation Committee endorsed him. They found some £300 to contest the seat when Lord Beresford suddenly resigned; and as it costs from £1,200 to £1,500 to contest a seat in parliament, the *Daily News* and other liberal papers appealed for funds. Besides, on the morning of the election the Marquis of Ripon and at least a dozen other lords and knights, to say nothing of M. P.s and other people, lent their motor cars and carriages to carry the voters to the polls. In fact he was so handsomely supported that he had more conveyances than the Tory candidate. True, Crooks had a great victory, but it is also true that if he had been a Socialist he would have received none of this liberal support.

As you know, M. P.s (members of parliament) are not paid in this country, and the first thing Crooks did in the House of Commons was to move a resolution in favor of payment, which was hopelessly defeated. I do not say he is not honest, but he is *not* a Socialist. He is simply a radical with slight leanings toward Social Democracy. He evidently knows that without the support of the Liberals he never could have won, and he will trim his sails pretty close to the creed of the Liberals, who had already arranged three banquets for him. The Liberals wanted to deal a blow at the government, and they supported Crooks to do it.

H. M. K.

FREE SOCIETY

Formerly THE FIREBRAND.

Published Weekly by.....A. ISAAK.

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.

Address all Communications and make all Money Orders payable to FREE SOCIETY, 407 PARK AVE., Chicago, Ill.

Entered at the Chicago post office as second-class matter, October 29, 1901.

The publishers as such are not necessarily in agreement with any opinions expressed by the contributors

ANARCHY—A social theory which regards the union of order with the absence of all direct government of man by man as the political ideal, absolute individual liberty.—Century Dictionary.

CHICAGO, SUNDAY, JULY 5, 1903.

421

If these figures correspond with the number printed on the wrapper of your FREE SOCIETY, your subscription expires with this number.

ATTENTION!

In a few days the publisher of FREE SOCIETY will make a short trip to the east, and while there would like to meet as many comrades as possible. He will make a point of visiting all the centers where there are groups, such as Boston, New York and surroundings, Philadelphia, Buffalo, Pittsburg and Allegheny, Cleveland and perhaps other places. He would like to hear from the comrades everywhere, so that he can be present when they hold their gatherings or picnics, in order to meet as many friends as possible. He is urged by his friends at the same time to get after the delinquent subscribers (of whom there are again a considerable number) with a sharp stick; but as he is naturally of a lenient disposition, they may meet him without fear. Let all who are desirous of getting acquainted write at once, and state where they can be found.

—o—

Attention.

Comrade Emma Goldman has agreed to make a propaganda tour in the West and the Pacific Coast during the months of July and August, if the money necessary for the trip can be raised. Now we ask all comrades who are interested in the tour to mail all contributions and communications either to my address or to Comrade Emma Goldman's, 50 First St., New York.

ROSE FRITZ.

San Francisco, Calif., 421 Castro St.

—o—

Important For Chicago Readers Only.

On July Fourth, at 3 p. m., all those who would rather be consistently happy than to set off fire-crackers, Roman candles, etc., in commemoration of an "independence" that does not exist, and shout for the Roosevelt brand of freedom, are invited to attend FREE SOCIETY'S Summer-Night Picnic, which will take place in a grove, illuminated in the evening by Japanese lanterns, near Irving Park Ave. and Campbell St., where the last picnic took place; about one mile north of Sharpshooter's Park. Refreshments suitable for the occasion will be on hand.

Those living near Western Avenue or Robey Street, can transfer to Elston Avenue cars, from which transfers can be taken for Irving Park Ave. cars going east. Others can take Lincoln Avenue cars, transfer to Irving Park or Bowmanville cars. The first brings you near the grove, and the second to Bertreau Avenue, from which walk up to Campbell west of Western Avenue.

—o—

Outpost Echoes.

Men come as masters go.

* * *

Not all change means progress.

* * *

Prejudice makes men into patriots.

* * *

Time is money to time-servers only.

* * *

Experience closes the mouth of scandal.

* * *

When God is dead man will begin to live.

* * *

Forced order is disorder in its best clothes.

* * *

The Fourth of July should be called Dependence Day.

* * *

Anarchy is the final reply which suffering makes to oppression.

* * *

It is better to be hated by others than to have to hate yourself.

* * *

He who lives upon his reputation will surely become bankrupt.

* * *

Banks are built strong because thievery must guard its possessions.

* * *

The monogamist just manages to believe that a little love is better than none.

* * *

Ingersoll was a radical who knew where to stop, and that was where popularity ended.

* * *

It is easier for diplomats to trouble over affairs in the Balkans than to look closely into things at home.

* * *

No wonder the Social Democrats won a great victory in the German elections; their platform did not even smell of Socialism.

* * *

Environment is to character what dye is to woolens; and while the inner self is impregnible, environment mainly determines conduct.

* * *

Those who believe that man will never be fit for liberty should be honest, and reveal to us the extent and character of their own misdemeanors, which must be many.

* * *

The government in the Philippines is endeavoring to confine the use of opium to Chinamen living there. The people are not even to be allowed to sleep away their misery. The people in America sleep without opium.

If the postoffice department is in such a scandalous condition of corruption, what are the probable conditions of the department of agriculture, the war department, and all the rest?

* * *

McKinley's name is now bracketed along with the corruptionists, and Postmaster-General Payne has added to his other responsibilities that of whitewashing the dead as well as the living.

* * *

A new book on Anarchism has come out in England. The author is said to be a young woman, an Anarchist. Morley Roberts, who writes the introduction, is a well-known English literary man, and in his introduction he, too, declares that he is an Anarchist.

* * *

The situation of the Negro is daily becoming more intolerable in this country, and minor race wars may be expected to break out sporadically anywhere and everywhere. The protestations of government about good intentions, and the letter of the Constitution, are worth exactly as much as the paper upon which they are written.

* * *

I lately implied that an Anarchist occasionally *imitates* Christians, monarchists, and democrats, and kills a man. This was a slip of the pen, for which I must make amends to Anarchism; for the truth is that Christians at any rate, Christians as Christians, have killed because they were but human, while Anarchists have killed, mistakenly or not, because they were *humane*.

* * *

Porto Rico has its libel law as well as Pennsylvania, but while that of the latter is ineffective, and has become a laughing stock because of its manifestly muzzling nature (a thing not to be tolerated by Americans) that of the former is in operation, and is stringently enforced. In our colonies, of course, the Constitution must be "liberally interpreted," or rather illiberally interpreted. The free press is for a "free people" (?) not for their slaves.

* * *

It is to be regreted that Louis F. Post, editor of *The Public*, allows himself to fall in with the army of indiscriminate and sensational scribblers, and use the word Anarchist in that inviduous sense which only mere smartness and the misjudgment of State Socialists makes possible. Mr. Post knows that if Anarchism does stand for lawlessness it also stands for order; and to lend his pen to the service of that obscurantism which identifies rapine, lynchings, and burning at the stake, with Anarchism, is a ridiculous, unworthy, and presumptious proceeding.

* * *

Octave Mirbeau, the French Anarchist author and playright, has met with great success on the Paris stage in his latest play, "Business is Business." The French capital is talking about it and for the most part praise is heard. A rich man goes thru more than average domestic and social experiences and trials, and tho family troubles of a grave character are added to his other difficulties, he lets nothing stand between him-

self and his business, which he worships as a very god. The effect upon character of the development of such a spirit is mercilessly exposed and satirized by Mirbeau.

AMERICUS.

—— o ——

Tyrants.

What are the means to deliver us from all this tyranny?

By opposing tyranny, by loosening every authority, each in his own manner and wherever he is able to do so. If someone should say that such protests are of no avail if they are not practised on a large scale, we should answer: "How will you succeed in doing it on a large scale if you do not begin on a small scale?" We believe that every refusal of military service, that every opposition to the great and small tyrants helps to undermine the whole edifice of authority. Don't forget that the example of the brave who venture to do this work will be contagious; for such protests are scarcely spoken of when they are imitated here and there and everywhere. What else would be the reason that such a deed is kept secret as much as possible?

No doubt much influence, a mysterious but strong influence is exercised by the men and women who have strength enough, even with great sacrifices on their part, to break the bonds in which they were kept. Let us never forget this truth: A people is what it deserves to be. If a people is in bondage, it is because it deserves no better fate, because its consists of slaves. Not the tyrant makes the slaves; but a servile people makes it easy and possible for the tyrant to reach his aim. How could it be possible to rule as a tyrant only for one week over a people who are really and truly free? It would not support tyranny for one day. But the people begin to make tyrants, and, if these act as such, the people utter complaints of their own work and are cowardly enough to yield to circumstances.

Does not Multatuli justly say, in his "Essay on Millions":

"Tyrants; to be sure, they exist; but who render their existence possible? Their surroundings, the people. All the tyrants mentioned in history could not have existed if the people, the surroundings in which these monsters lived, had not enabled them to play their tyrant's parts from age to age. They, the people, the surroundings—the chaff, as they are called—crouched, fawned, dissembled, applauded every arbitrary deed, every despotic action of the tyrants—where an ox grazes there must be grass, and the people have always been willing to be the grass which the two-legged oxen—beasts of prey—nibbled and trod. A people, therefore, deserves the fate it has. No tyrants, no bloodsuckers could exist if the people would not suffer them, would have nothing to do with them. The people have always remained the same. When Nero set Rome on fire, the people shouted. It was the people who cried: "Crucify Jesus; set Barrabas free!" Leaders, preachers of new ideas have ever been abused and thrown at with filth by the Schmoels and Judases among the people."

Before all other things it is necessary to become aware of our condition. First, we must feel the bondage in which we are kept; for no means are sought to get out of it before that is the case. That is the reason why we have, in the first place, to revolutionize the heads, so that the people understand it will not be so difficult for the ninety-eight to get rid of the two who cling to the others in order to suck up the best vital fluids and who cause the tree to pine.

Hypocrisy is a great obstacle in the way, and it puts on such an attractive mask to draw the masses on the wrong track. "So *much* is done for the people,"—that is the common saying, which becomes a pretext to lull oneself asleep. But without taking into consideration that all this is philanthropy—and this always demoralizes the giver as well as the receiver (being nothing but wholesale stealing to give back in detail) and afterwards being praised as a benefactor of the human race—as we begin to analyze it, it is rather insignificant, because the greater part give from their abundance without denying themselves anything.

Tolstoy saw thru this game, and therefore wrote: "Temperance is made much of, but in such a way that it cannot diminish drunkenness; education is made much of, but in such a way that, far from annihilating ignorance, it is increased; liberty and the constitution are made much of, but in such a way that despotism is not prevented; the fate of the working classes, but in such a way that they are not protected against slavery; Christianity, but only the official Christian faith which supports the governments instead of overthrowing them."

That is the reason why we also preach a crusade against hypocrisy . . . As soon as the feeling of self-respect awakens and grows, we will no longer suffer everything; we shall begin to be men in our own circle, men who distinguish themselves by thinking for themselves. We make onrselves free and involuntarily we shall rouse others by our deeds.—*F. Domela Niewenhuis.*

—— o ——

A Reply to Some Critics.

Tucker thinks it a screaming joke that I should use a word too long for his comprehension; and, benevolence being a leading feature in my character, as Mr. Nasby says, I will give him a chance to laugh and grow fat over another. My reply to his pen-ult-im-ate fling, will do very well for his last. My articles may be nonsense—but, they have taught him quite a lot. And the good work is not over yet. He speaks in the last issue of *Liberty* about "the contention of some Communists that only those are entitled to resist who are too weak to resist successfully." Now but for his manifest slowness in absorbing new ideas, he would understand ere now that the Communist referred to (this child) neither said anything tantamount to that, nor is the habit of discussing any question so bottomless as what people are "entitled" to do. What he did say was that organizations to resist "invasion," as they call it, are themselves worthy to be resisted; *because they alone are strong enough to "invade"* successfully. And is not that time? What else is any government than an organization founded ostensibly to resist "invasion"? And if one can do such very hard work as read Hugo Bilgram's, S. R's, and Mr. Tucker's own, long letters on whether boycotting is "invasion;" of what must his brains be made not to see that they do not know, have no means of telling, and could not decide in their organizations to resist "invasion," otherwise than by setting up conots, recording precedents, developing a system of law, in short reestablishing government full blown? On the other hand, did any one of them ever know an individual strong enough to go round "invading" without such an organization at his back? One little Jack the Giant Killer has always been too much for fellows who fancied themselves so stout ever since Good King Arthur ruled the land. And, even in spite of organization, Monster Slayers are neither obsolete nor too weak to resist successfully as yet!

Remarkably enough, it was Tucker who put that very idea into my head, when I was astraddle of that individualistic fence from which he has not himself come down. I acknowledge this obligation the more cheerfully because another criticaster has recently objected to me (in *Lucifer*) that I am "tiresome, arrogant, and a teacher." In common with all who have ever learned anything, I learned early that teachers are a tiresome and arrogant class. (Promoters of the Movement in Favor of Ignorance do not learn; but they know that by "instinct.") Notwithstanding these faults of teachers, I always liked anyone who could teach me, in proportion as I found such to be the case. That is why I am now able to teach Mr. Peabody, and Mr. Harman (if they prove teachable), and my own old teacher, Tucker.

C. L. JAMES.

—— o ——

An Egyptian Fable.

THE WISH OF THE PEOPLES.

One day God invited all the peoples to appear before him and pray for a favor. On the appointed day all the peoples gathered at the throne of God. The English asked for good fortune in trade. "Granted!" cried the Almighty. The French wished that their women should be the most charming of all women. "Granted!" the answer ran also this time. The Germans wished to be the strongest. "Granted!" The Russians the biggest. "Granted!" The Orientals prayed for a good government. "Ah," God cried out; "that is beyond my power!"—*Ex.*

—— o ——

Should Blaze the Way.

It's a pity FREE SOCIETY has to quote from *Freedom* on education. It should blaze the way itself.

Even Koresh finds it necessary to damn the public school system, how much more necessary should it be for those who want to get away from the thraldom of all oppression thru law?

If Anarchists will hang on to the public school system, they will not be the pioneers of liberty. It stands for enslavement.

FRANCIS B. LIVESEY.

REPLY.

Anarchists fight *all* authoritarian institutions, altho they do not make it a particular issue or their hobby to make war against the public schools separately. Koreh, however, does not "damn" the public shools on account of the pernicious influence that uniformity and authority impose upon them, but because they are not under the domination of Koresh himself, who is strictly an authoritarian.

A. I.

A Vindication of Anarchism.

VIII (concluded.)

All this I can say without expressing any opinion, Polytheistic, Monotheistic, Pantheistic, or Atheistic, as my own; for all this I see in other men; and thus far therefore I am within the inductive method, as I proposed to be thruout. If the reader has caught me in any expression from which he can infer anything about my own belief or disbelief in "the Righteous Eternal," my sense of sin, conscious need of a Savior, or profession of conversion, he will probably witness that it was a slip, immaterial to the demonstration thruout which I have tried to state, not what I think but what I know (that other men think, with such and effects upon their conduct according to their respective creeds): while clearly I should have gone outside induction if I had allowed myself to entertain any such question as the value of arguments for one creed or another. Sticking then to the substantial identity of religion and art, I shall guard further against misapprehension by a remark on the difference of their form.

Fra Angelico refusing the bishopric of Florence from pious motives, impresses us very differently from Fra Angelico painting a picture of the Blessed Virgin; but the strain of feeling which inspired these actions of the same person was identical. I conclude this part of my argument then by pointing out that the Anarchistic conclusion of Religion has been, so far as they are distinguishable, reached sooner by Art; but not without very analogous processes. As Religion has been encumbered in its evolution by mummery, so has art by convention. As the intellectual side of the former has been oppressed by dogmas, so has that of the other by arbitrary canons of criticism. The emotional element, which is the essential one, has been the deliverer of both.*

Nor is it difficult to see that in one case as in the other the contest has turned about a point not yet distinctly specified. The fundamental unity of Religion and Art is not to be overlooked. Originally but one, both begin with emotion; emotion gives rise to imagination; imagination has a speculative side, which in religion is theology, but in art criticism; and a practical side, which in both has the nature of sacrament. Between these the morals, whether of art or religion, are another connecting link, related to imagination as object to subject. For morals have, like imagination, a practical and a theoretical side. As the religious teacher founds his theory of ethics on his theory of the Supreme Being, and requires of the rites he is to approve that they shall promote morality according to his ideal, so the art-critic bases his canons upon his view of beauty (which is the unformulable Reality), and pronounces art-methods good or otherwise, according as they conform to his canons. In both cases what hinders progress is tradition. The example of good artists are to art what the practises handed down from the ancestral Totem are to piety. Such a servitude to precedent is obviously incompatible with improvement. It will do most mischief where it is strongest; and tho the differentiation of art from religion has never gone very far, there has been a formal differentiation, introducing a distinction of this kind, ever since art began to find beauty in other spheres than those in which religion finds it. Originally identical in scope, art and religion have moved away from each other in proportion as religion has become abstract, analytic, and monotheistic, because art always remains concrete, synthetic, and polymorphous. An extreme example of coincidence between the religion and art of a civilized people is furnished by the Greeks; an extreme case of divergence by the Mussulmans, whose piety hardly admits expression in forms of art, and whose poetry, architecture, etc., is almost wholly secular in aim. From the character of this differentiation it follows that the spirit common to Art and Religion has not had to fight quite so hard against the petrifying tendencies of tradition in the former spheres as in the latter. And from this, too, we might infer, what we shall certainly find to be the fact, that dogmatic religion has always regarded art with an envious and jaundiced eye, as something which beats it at its own trade. It was a deep remark of Gibbon's abundantly borne out by the experience of missionaries since his time, that a people, in changing their creed, adopt practically only that part of the new one which falls in with their old habits; so that, *unless an entire new civilization be introduced*, as during our time in Polynesia, their morals are no better for the change.

We sometimes wonder that our ancestors, who read the New Testament, should have made it their chief duties to fight Mussulmans and burn heretics; but if we remember these ancestors were barbarians unaccustomed to value any virtue less common than animal courage, we shall no more find it surprising than that our contemporaries, who have heard of Mary Magdalen, treat the misfortunes of women in a way possible only for such nominal Christians as are in fact bourgeois. Art, however, is not content to embody old generalizations in forms of beauty, but perpetually seeks new subjects. Thus it is progressive, in the sense of anticipating induction, while the rhetorical orthodox morality remains stationary; and experimental while that is dogmatical.*

* This point is very well brought out, so far as Art is concerned, in Prof. R G. Moulton's work on "Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist." For a long time Shakespeare was either altogether condemned by critics or apologetically defended as a self-taught genius ignorant of classic standards, because he did not observe the unities nor the law that tragedy and comedy must not be mixed; and since these rules have come to be admitted inapplicable to a new school of art, still canons of an equally arbitrary character are made to limit the allowable in drama. Ben Jonson, for example, is pronounced a sinner against fundamental laws because his characters are idealized to the point of unreality. But art refuses to be bound by any rules outside its own instincts, and a scientific criticism can come only from induction, which, instead of dogmatizing about how it is legitimate to produce poetical effects, delights to learn from the men whose genius it scrutinizes as many ways as possible in which such effects can be produced. The theory of Beauty stated in this section may be in some respects original, and therefore may be required to vindicate itself inductively. I will say that I have read and digested all previous speculations on the nature of beauty; as well as all human history, no part with more attention than that which relates to evolution of Art, and on which my view is founded. They divide, like the arguments of other sciences, into classes, one kind proceeding from assumed first principles to particulars, the other from particulars to generalizations. The first method is now most in favor with German writers, the other with English; but in the works of the Greek philosophers they are to a considerable extent united. Obviously both are quite legitimate; nay, each is required to complete the other. Without inductive analysis, there is no verification; without hypothesis as a basis for synthesis, there is little progress. They seem, I think, to converge on the principle here stated; which I learned in a different way from either—*Beauty is emotion typically thrown into objectivity*. The reason neither states the principle as clearly as it might, is that both, in modern times at least, begin with the beauty of inanimate Nature. But this is not following the guidance of history. The beauty of human minds is in fact recognized first. Music, the idealized language of human passion (see Herbert Spencer's essay on its "Origin and Function"), is the art which, in all countries, first attains to a fair success in producing beautiful effects. Poetry differentiates from it (Encyclopedia Britannica article, *voc. cit.*),—the bards are "singers" before they are recognized as "makers." The kind of beauty given prominence in all early poetry is, again, that of passion, either lyrically or dramatically expressed. In Homer and subsequent writers even as late as Dante (see Macaulay's essay on the Italian poets), it is quite remarkable how little the authors seem themselves impressed with that natural beauty, of which, by chance allusions, they make us see a great deal. Even person l beauty does not become a subject of art till somewhat late—Homer never describes Helen as Dante does Beatrice; tho he is still fonder of details than Dante. It is not very different with other arts Sculpture reaches perfection in delineating "loves and wars of old"; painting, during the Middle Ages, attained its highest glory with legendary and religious scenes. But it is hardly too much to say that landscape art began with Claude Loraine; while that which finds the ideal in a daisy or a bunch of daffodils is very much more modern yet. This is very intelligible if we take emotion to be the real object imitated in all Art. The fundamental *mimesis* is Drama, at first, as is well known, imperfectly differentiated from Ode. It falls into three main phases —High Comedy, in which the emotion represented attains simply to harmony and beauty; Tragedy in which it attains, but is cut down by the black environment; and Low Comedy, or Farce, in which beauty is suggested by failure to attain it. They have their analogues even in so utilitarian an art as architecture. Finally, the beauty of nature, the last which man appreciates, has, for the artist's eye its Tragedy in terrific phenomena; its Comedy in ordinary landscape and its Farce in such objects as a litter of pigs

* A critic on my history of the French Revolution says it reads at times "as if thought flowed too fast for speech and found difficulty in getting itself expressed; the result is a certain turgidity." I accept the explanation. Such turgidity is inevitable, not only under the necessity of applying to a great subject the restraints of periodical publication, but that of applying to particular cases the most general principles. I am writing now about Anarchy I try to show its necessity to human perfection in the fine arts, as in science and in life. To attempt settling such a question as the identity of the True and the Beautiful, by the way, in such an argument, would be an intolerable digression; even if the unanswerableness of the inquiry had not, ever since Plato started it, been felt as half its interest. But I expect the criticism that to say Art, or religion, rather than increase of knowledge, made Hellenism out of the crude paganism which preceded Homer, or the Judæo Christian movement out of the worship of Moloch and Ashtor-Chemosh, is "inconsistent" with the often repeated statement that knowledge is the progressive element in civilization. The solution of the paradox is in the words of my text, "art is progressive, in the sense of anticipating induction"; which must also do for the best suggestion I can take space to make on the identity of the True and the Beautiful. For what is Knowledge? According to the Baconian philosophy, by which it has been principally promoted, it is the theory (proved correct by result) of Making or Doing something; as, according to the older philosophy of the Socratists, it is harmony between the conceptions of the human mind, and the facts of nature. Now the first step to this is clearly forming an image of something to be Made or Done, which, again, is the function of Art; tho that first step be perfectly useless without induction, which reduces the ideals of art to practise. The images of the dreamer are, in scholastic phrase, the final causes, to which the inductions of the philosopher are corresponding efficient causes. And

Religion, we have seen, has its periods of renovation, dependent on general previous advances in knowledge. It also has this advantage over fine arts, that they require patronage, and languish during periods of poverty and social decline, like the last centuries of the Roman Empire; while religion being the multitude's outlet for imagination, often revives noteably during those very times when the influence of those "higher classes" whose development characterizes a particular civilization, is declining with themselves. But so long as the social state preserves a "moving equilibrium," literature does more to promote advance in moral condition than the pulpit, because instead of pounding an enfeebled string it enlists the sympathies continually in new phases of human life. The highest praise we can bestow on a great preacher, like Bunyan, is that his view of mankind resembles the dramatist's. The most contemptuous thing a critic unfavorably impressed with a poet of evident merit, like Euripides, can say about him is that he often sinks into a preacher, who bores us with antiquated types and reflections on what men should be, instead of showing them to us as they are. The secret of the pulpit's hostility to the stage is that the moralizing influence of the stage extends to a class out of the pulpit's reach. These things are well brought out in sundry portions of Lecky's "History of Rationalism." But perhaps Oscar Wilde's book, "Intentions," contains the best exposition of a view familiar to the artistic mind, and of which we shall have occasion to make further use; that that diversity of characters which Art delights to expand, instead of requiring reduction, pulpit fashion, to one standard, *is itself the necessary condition of all moral progress.*

IX

Socialism and Anarchism have so many things in common that the inductive character of the latter requires vindication by comparison with the rival scheme of reform. Socialism, indeed, is the most indefinite of terms; and a wiser remark upon it never was made than this, that modern Socialists are not to be disposed of by that easy stroke of the pen which identifies them all with people so curiously unlike them and one another as Sakya Mouni, Plato, the Essenes, St. Benedict, John Ball, Sir Thomas More, Campanella, Fourier, and Babœuf! What all these had in common was only a vague perception that personal covetousness has its evils, and that there is something to be said for the communistic life which preceded invention and private property. Neither is Socialism, nor certainly Anarchism, to be disposed of by any loose reference to Evolution and the fact that men in their earliest state had neither separate possessions nor a government. All such lumping generalizations approach the metaphysical character, and are the abhorrence of that inductive historical sociology which has seen that the line of progress is not straight, but rather spiral or zigzag. The "scientific Socialism" of Marx alone is worthy to be compared with Anarchism, when we would ascertain which, if either, sustains the crucial tests of induction. For a good historical sketch of Socialism, bringing out the peculiar superiority of Marx's doctrine very well, together with a rather superficial view of Anarchism, see the Encyclopedia Britannica article "Socialism," which should be read in connection with that on "Political Economy" in the same work.

The school of Marx and Engels claims to have discovered a law of social progress, which they accuse the Anarchists of ignoring, misunderstanding, or evading. That it rests on a much narrower induction than the Anarchistic philosophy may be gathered from this, that it is altogether an economic law, taking no account of the crime problem, war, religion, morals, or esthetics. Nor is this to be overlooked, that Marx was originally an *Anarchist*; who saw his ideal, not in any kind of governmental Socialism; for government, he knew, belonged to and must pass away with militarism; but in international unions of the several trades, which are to modern what nations were to earlier civilizations. Only after his Social Democracy had absorbed the moribund party of Lassalle, did he become too much of a politician for persistency upon this line. But let us see what his law of social progress is. Since the invention of gunpowder, wealth has become so much more important a factor of military power than personal valor, numbers, or genius, that these may be ignored for obsolescent elements in that problem presented by the nations' struggle for existence. In modern war, as a French king said, the last louis d'or must win. Accordingly, war itself is going out of fashion. The poorer nation knows it cannot now fight the richer. The richer knows it must win in the battle fields of trade if it would keep its position; and it shrinks from war, accordingly, as from an impediment to money-making. Moreover the progress of mechanical invention is so enormously increasing the capacity for productive industry that improvement in means of destruction, tho considerable, sinks into an incident of the larger movement and engages comparatively little of the world's ambition. Thus from a military, we have passed, since the sixteenth century, into an industrial state of competition. The aim of each nation, and each individual within each nation, with exceptions negligible because inevitably decreasing in importance, is to grow rich by producing more cheaply than competitors. The great instrument of progress in this race is wealth itself. As the richer nation can certainly beat the poorer, because it can spend more on appliances of war which have reduced the individual soldier, tho he were a Wellington, to insignificance in comparison with modern artillery, so the richer firm, unless it consists of actual fools, must outdo competitors, because it has the means of enlarging plants, cheapening product, and seizing opportunities, in higher degree than they. The inevitable result is concentration of capital. But upon this thirst for gain there waits a Nemesis. The "surplus product" which increases the wealth of any employer is what remains over the renovation of his continually wearing machinery or other capital, and the support of his men. But his product is not directly applicable to either purpose. If his product be, for example, hats; hats will not repair machinery, nor feed men, who wear hats indeed, but only want a few. The product, to become in its turn capital, must be *convertible*. Convertible means saleable. Who buys it? Principally the proletaires in every trade. Since an indispensable condition of cheap product is cheap labor; and since cheapening of labor means limiting the laborer's ability to purchase, the capitalists, as a class, are obviously in a dilemma, losing customers all around by the very operation they must employ to attract custom away from each other! The pursuing Fate of capitalism is a General Glut, when the cheap producers will be unable to buy the cheap product. This result has hitherto been staved off by extensions of the market by combinations like our Trusts; by struggles between these and the laborer's counter-combinations, that is by strikes and lockouts, which limit production more than they do consumption; but above all by commercial crises, when over-production in certain lines induces the failure of many firms, the absorption of their capital by stronger competitors, suspension of their business and gradually catching up by other lines, which, tho always somewhat affected during the crisis, have not come to a standstill. All this, however, is but the clutching of the man on brink of a glacier. General glut must come at last: and with the cessation of production for profit no longer realizable, since prices will then have fallen to the cost of production, there must be either general starvation of producers in the midst of their exuberant plenty; or the producers must dismiss the capitalists as a class henceforth functionless, and, themselves owning the plants, take for their wages the product; which, of course would immediately solve the problem. Reduced to a short formula, the law would be this. *Production for profit or for surplus product, cannot last, because, according to a rule already accepted, competition reduces the value-measure of product, to the cost of production—where there is no such surplus.*

Now, a person disposed for whatever reason to dispute the Marxian law, would certainly take issue, inductive fashion, upon its harmony with the facts. War has not gone out of fashion, and does not appear to be going. The great wars of the last half century, the Crimean, the war of 1859, the Schleswig-Holstein war, the Sadowa war, the Civil war in the United States, the Franco-Prussian war, the Russian and Turkish war of 1876, the revolutions of Spanish-America, the war of the Indian Mutiny, the wars in China, the Cuban war, the war in South Africa, the prolonged and chronic but now finished war of white man against Indian—all were for commercial advantages. The suggestion of moral purpose is humbug. Sometimes the ambition of a king or a president made some figure among causes; but a market was always the prize really fought for.

C. L. JAMES.

(To be continued.)

these images, in themselves, are the ideals of beautiful art, posited as contradictory and unrealizeable until advancing knowledge makes them otherwise. In physical matters, instances are familiar. Ages before Columbus, supplied with compass and astrolabe, thought it seriously worth while to attempt crossing the Atlantic, Seneca foretold, in poetry, a time when Ocean should relax his chain, a mighty continent unfold, and Thule be no more the last of lands. So, in the moral spheres, it is, that idealists, like Moses and Jesus, kindled long since aspirations such as Matthew Arnold says induction now warrants, after a state which induction, by leading up to the threshold of practical Anarchy, may now be actually bringing in.

AGENTS FOR FREE SOCIETY.

The following named persons will receive and receipt for subscriptions fo FREE SOCIETY.

ALLEGHENY Pa.—H. Bauer 73 Springgarden Ave.
ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.—M. Kisluck, 1108 Baltic Ave.
BOSTON—K. A. Snellenberg, 31 Beech Glen St., Roxbury.
BROOKLYN.—M. Metzkow, 174 Ralph St.
CHICAGO—T. Appel, 1228 Milwaukee Av.
CLEVELAND—E. Schilling, 55 Yeakel St.
LONDON, Eng.—T. Cantwell, 127 Ossulton St., N. W.
NEW YORK—A. Lopatiner, 180 Forsyth
PHILADELPHIA—Natasha Notkin, 242 N. Second St.

RECEIPTS.

Yasha Littroff, San Francisco, $8. Dumas, Langston, Pearson, Wiegand, Uhl, Conveart, each $1. Dalitsh, Smith, Rabinowitz, each 50c. Block, Weber, Fuller, Oliver, each 25c.

MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM.

By Peter Kropotkin.

(Translated from the Russian by David A. Modell—and revised by the author.)

Considered by some Kropotkin's best work.

Well and tastefully printed on good paper in clear and large type. 96 pages (or more.)

CONTENTS:

I. Two Fundamental Tendencies in Society. The Kinship of Anarchism and the Popular Creative Tendency.

II. The Intellectual Movement of the Eighteenth Century: Its fundamental traits; the investigation of all phe nomena by the scientific method. The Stagnation of Thought at the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century. The Awakening of Socialism: Its Influence upon the Development of Science. The Fifties.

III. Auguste Comte's Attempt to build up a Synthetic Philosophy. The causes of his failure. The religious explanation of the moral sense in man.

IV. The Flowering of the exact Sciences in 1856-62. The Development of the Mechanical World—Conception, embracing the Development of Human Ideas and Institutions. A Theory of Evolution.

V. The Possibility of a New Synthetic Philosophy. Herbert Spencer's Attempt; Why it failed. The Methodnot sustained. A false conception of "The Struggle for Existence."

VI. The Causes of this Mistake. The Teaching of the Church: "the World is steeped in Sin." The Government's inculcation of the same view of "Man's Radical Perversity." The Views of Modern Anthropology upon this subject. The Development of forms of Life by the "Masses," and the Law. Its Twofold Character.

VII. The place of Anarchism in Science. Its endeavor to formulate a Synthetic Conception of the World.—Its Object.

VIII. Its origin How its Ideal is developed by the Natural-Scientific Method.

IX. A Brief Summary of the Conclusions Reached by Anarchism: Law. Morality. Economic Ideas. The Government.

X. Continuation: Methods of Action. The Understanding of Revolutions and their Birth. The Creative Ingenuity of the People. Conclusion.

Price, 25 cents

Send orders to Natasha Notkin, 242 N. second St., Philadelphia, Pa.

BOOK LIST.

ALL ORDERS FOR THE FOLLOWING BOOKS

RECEIVED AT THIS OFFICE.

Essays on the Social Problem.....H. Addis	05
The New Hedonism.....Grant Allen	05
The Evolution of the Family. By Jonathan Mayo Crane.....	05
God and the State.....Bakunin	05
The Same. London edition.....	10
Whitman's Ideal Democracy and Other Writings.....Helena Born	1.00
Love's Coming-of-Age. Edward Carpenter.....	1.00
Prodigal Daughter; or, The Price of Virtue.....Rachel Campbell	25
The Worm Turns.....V. de Cleyre	10
The Emancipation of Society from Government.....Dallan Doyle	05
Roosevelt, Czolgosz, and Anarchism.....Jay Fox	03
Crime and Criminals....C. Darrow	10
Realism in Literature and Art."..	05
Hilda's Home. Cloth $1.....Rosa Graul	50
Moribund Society and Anarchy. Cloth 60c.....Jean Grave	25
Motherhood in Freedom..Harman	05
Origin of Anarchism....C. L. James	05
Government Analyzed.....Kelso	50
Anarchism: Its Philosophy and Ideal.....Peter Kropotkin	05
Anarchist Communism: Its Basis and Principles..... "	05
An Appeal to the Young..... "	05
Anarchist Morality..... "	05
Expropriation..... "	05
Field, Factory and Workshop.. "	45
Law and Authority..... "	05
Memoirs of a Revolutionist..... "	2.00
Mutual Aid, a Factor in Evolution..... "	2.00
Organized Vengeance..... "	03
Paris Commune..... "	05
The State: Its Historic Role..... "	10
The Wage System. Revolutionary Government..... "	05
Resist Not Evil. Cloth. Clarence S. Darrow.....	75
Social Democracy in Germany.....Gustave Landauer	02
History of the Commune. Cloth... Lissagaray	75
Conduct and Profession,...Darraw	10
Wind-Harp Songs....J. Wm. Lloyd	1.00
The Economics of Anarchy.....Dyer D. Lum	25
Anarchy. (Is It All a Dream? Jas. F. Morton, Jr.)....Malatesta	10
A Talk about Anarchist Communism between two Workers... '	05
A Chambermaid's Diary.....Octave Mirbeau	50
God and Government: The Siamese Twins of Superstition...W. Nevill	05
The Deistic Pestilence...John Most	05
The Pyramid of Tyranny.....F. Domela Nieuweuhuis	05
Mating or Marrying, Which?.....W. H. Van Ornum	05
Evolution and Revolution...Reclus	05
Tolstoy.....Clarence S. Darrow	10
Pure Economy.....J. H. Rowell	10
Pages of Socialist History.....W. Tcherkesoff	30
The Slavery of Our Times. Cloth. .....Leo Tolstoy	75
Our Worship of Primitive Social Guesses.....E. C. Walker	15
Revival of Puritanism..... "	10
Vice: Its Friends and Foes..... "	15
What the Young Need to Know "	10
The Ballad of Reading Gaol.....Oscar Wilde	10
Life Without a Master. 336 pp. Cloth $1.50.....J. Wilson	1.00
The New Dispensation. Cloth. "	1.50
The Coming Woman...Lillie White	05
Anarchism and Outrage.....	03
Anarchy on Trial.....	05

History of the French Revolution.

— BY —

C. L. JAMES.

An excellent history of the French Revolution, well written by one thoroly familiar with his subject. Special care has been exercised to give the facts as they are, the author not having made himself the champion of any faction.

Justice, Wilmington, Del., says of it:

It is concise; it is accurate; and above all, it deals with essentials; the author has entered into the spirit of the Revolution.

Azariah S. Root, librarian at Oberlin College Library, Oberlin, Ohio, says:

I was much interested in looking over the work. It seems to me to indicate careful study of the sources, and to be the work of one profoundly interested in democracy.

It is neatly printed from large type on good book paper, with a substantial binding. There are 343 pages, with an index and bibliographical epitome.

Price, bound in cloth, $1 postpaid; paper bound copies, 50 cents, 9 cents extra for postage. Send orders to

ABE ISAAK Jr., 407 Park Ave., Chicago, Ill.

A PHYSICIAN IN THE HOUSE.

IT IS THE BEST MEDICAL BOOK FOR THE HOME YET PRODUCED

— BY —

DR. J. H. GREER.

IT HAS 16 COLORED PLATES SHOWING DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE HUMAN BODY

This book is up to date in every particular. It will save you doctor bills. It tells you how to cure yourself by simple and harmless home remedies. The book recommends no poisonous or dangerous drugs. It teaches simple common sense methods in accordance with Nature's laws. It does not endorse dangerous experiments with the surgeon's knife. It teaches how to save health and life by safe methods. It is entirely free from technical rubbish. It teaches prevention—that it is better to know how to live and avoid disease than to take any medicine as a cure.

It teaches how typhoid and other fevers can be both prevented and cured. It gives the best known treatment for La Grippe, diphteria, catarrh, consumption, appendicitis and every other disease. This book is not an advertisement and has no medecine to sell. It tells you how to live that you may prolong life. It opposes medical fads of all kinds and makes uncompromising war on vaccination and the use of anti-toxine. It has hundreds of excellent recipes for the cure of the various diseases. The chapter on painless midwifery is worth its weight in gold to women It has a large number of valuable illustrations. The "Care of Children' is something every mother ought to read. It teaches the value of air, sunshine, and water as medecines. This book cannot fail to please you. If you are looking for health by the safest and easiest means, do not delay getting the book. It is printed in clear type on good book paper, beautifully bound in cloth and gold letters. It has 800 octavo pages.

FORMERLY SOLD FOR $2.75. SEND ORDERS TO FREE SOCIETY.

MORIBUND SOCIETY AND ANARCHY.

Translated from the French of

JEAN GRAVE

By VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE

CONTENTS:

The Anarchistic Idea and Its Development.—Individualism and Solidarity.—Too Abstract.—Is Man Evil?—Property.—The Family.—Authority.—The Magistracy.—The Right to Punish and the Savants.—The Influence of Environment.—"The Country."—The Patriotism of the Governing Classes.—Militarism.—Colonization.—There are no Inferior Races.—Why We are Revolutionist.—As to What Means follow from the Principles.—Revolution and Anarchy.—The Efficacy of Reforms.—The Experimental Method.—What Then?—Anarchism and its Practicability.—The Unvarnished Truth.

The book is printed in large type, and consists of 176 pages.

Price, paper cover, 25c; bound 60c. Five copies $1.

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY.

FIELD, FACTORY AND WORKSHOP.

BY PETER KROPOTKIN.

This interesting work has now been published in a popular edition. No student of social and economical affairs can do without it.

The book contains the following chapters: The Decentralization of Industries.—The Possibilitits of Agriculture.—Small Industrial Villages.—Brain Work and Manual Work.—Conclusion.—Appendix

Price, paper cover, 40 cents, postpaid 45 cents.

Order from FREE SOCIETY.

COLLEGE of MEDICINE & SURGERY, Chicago

Four years Graded Course.
Laboratories fully equipped.
Abundance of Clinical Material.
FEES MODERATE.
Fall term opens in September
Write today for Catalog to

FLORENCE DRESSLER, M. D., Sec'y
245-247 Ashland Ave., Chicago, Ill.